M. Sivathanu Pillai
J. W. Tolson
G. Velu Pillai
P. Vivekanandan and
S. Krishna Iyer

MR. A. LAKSHIMINARAYANA AIYAR : (*Financial Secretary to Government*) : I second it.

The motion was put and carried.

The bill was referred to a Select Committee.

THE TRAVANCORE MERCHANDISE—MARKS BILL.

MR. PUTHUPALLI S. KRISHNA PILLAI : I rise to introduce the Merchandise Marks Bill and beg to state that the same be read in the Assembly.

MR. A. LEKSHIMINARAYANA AIYAR : I second it.

MR. PUTHUPALLI S. KRISHNA PILLAI: Sir, I may be permitted to add a few words in support of the principles contained in the Bill. The honourable members of this House might remember that during the last session when we had passed a large number of commercial bills the Dewan-President had stated that in order to have a complete round of commercial laws there should be an enactment relating to Merchandise Marks. The bill was then under preparation. But as the same bill was being considered by the Indian Legislature at that time, this Government thought it advisable to wait till that Legislature passed the measure. It will be found by the honourable members that there are important amendments made to the Travancore Penal Code and the Sea Customs Act. There are also various other provisions as explained by me in the statement of objects and reasons dealing with false marks and trade marks. I may add that the subject of Trade Marks has been comprehensively dealt with by the Trade Marks Bill passed by this Assembly and this bill only supplements what has already been done by the Legislature in respect of commercial bills.

The question that the Travancore Merchandise Marks Bill be read in the Assembly was put and carried.

SECRETARY : The Title of the Bill shall be "The Travancore Merchandise Marks Bill."

MR. PUTHUPALLI S. KRISHNA PILLAI : I beg to move that the Bill be referred to a select committee consisting of the following members :-

Messrs. S. Chattanatha Karayalar
K. G. Govindan
S. Govinda Pillai
K. C. Karunakâran
T. C. Kesava Pillai
T. T. Kesavan Sastri
N. M. Muhamed Abdul Kadir

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. Puthupalli S. Krishna Pillai]

Messrs. N. Narayana Kurup
K. Narayanaperumal Nadar
Sry. T. Narayani Amma
Messrs. N. Ramakrishna Pillai
M. Ramiah Pillai
Puliyoor T. P. Velayudhan Pillai
J. E. A. Periera and
J. W. Tolson.

MR. A. LEKSHMINARAYANA AIYAR: I second it.

The motion was put and carried. The bill was referred to a Select Committee.

THE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT BOARD.

MR. A. GOPALA MENON: Sir, I beg to move the following motion:—

"That the question whether the Economic Development Board should continue to work on its present constitution be taken up for discussion."

Sir, the idea of Government in placing this motion before the House is to elicit the views of the honourable members in regard to the possibilities, and the ways and means, of making the Economic Development Board function more purposefully, usefully and to the greater benefit of the country at large. The Board consists of 32 members and there are no standing committees to which subjects are assigned. As questions arise, as notice of motions come, *ad hoc* committees are formed and they go into the questions and report on them, after due consideration and investigation. The Board has to meet four times in the year and during the meeting, all the members are present, so much so the scope and opportunity for detailed discussion is denied. Consequently all details in regard to the schemes are not fully dealt with and examined, but the general purpose alone being agreed upon, and only a resolution, accepted in pursuance of each recommendation, is sent up to Government for their consideration and approval. The difficulty therefore is that with a Board consiting of 32 members, the usefulness of such an institution is considerably reduced.

Government have from time to time pointed out the necessity of constituting standing committees and working through them so that what might be called a full meeting of the board may not be necessary at all times. In constituting the Board, the term of which has recently expired, the Government deliberately insisted that it should function through sub-committees. Each such committee should consist of 3 or at the most 5 members. It was stated that the object of the Board must be to help Government to bring about well conceived schemes of important economic planning concentrating attention on a few most urgent and important problems.

From the nature of the present constitution of the board, more prominence is given to questions of the hour, and matters of immediate moment and anything like a well conceived scheme of economic

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

planning could not be sent up from the Board except on a few stray questions. The Government again insisted in the same G. O. that the Board should not fritter away its attention on a large number of questions. I am sorry to say that, owing to pressure of existing conditions and the importance of day to day problems, it has not been possible to restrict the scope of the board to what the Government actually required of it, that is to say, not to fritter away its attention on a large number of questions. Nor is it possible, as Government had pointed out, to pick out a few among the whole lot of questions submitted to the board, such as are considered to be most urgent and important. All problems of immediate moment are of great importance from the standpoint of one group or individual member of the board representing a particular interest. That is the difficulty with which we are faced. The term of the Board reconstituted in 1937 having now run out, and Government having arrived at a provisional conclusion that the board to be useful must reduce its membership and, if possible, a certain number of standing committees should be constituted, so that the Board will restrict themselves to very important problems which come within their purview, it is suggested that a body consisting of say 12 or 15 members would be sufficient. They can form into small sub-committees. For example, a sub-committee each can be formed for agriculture and co-operation, for banking and industry, for marketing and rural re-construction, for development schemes and economic planning. Something on these lines may be constituted by Government with a reduced number of official members, keeping in view a large number of non-officials in such bodies. The board must have power to co-opt experts as they come to different questions falling within their purview; such experts can either be officers or otherwise. Each sub-committee should function in this manner and report to a general meeting to be held, not 4 times a year, but once or twice, and then formulate schemes for submission to Government. In such a situation, the Board will not have necessarily to confine its attention to matters of immediate moment. Such is the present idea of Government. As I said, it is only a provisional conclusion arrived at. It is subject to modifications as this honourable house thinks fit. It is with this view that this motion has been presented for discussion.

Mr. M. SIVATHANU PILLAI: May I know whether any one of the recommendations of the Board has ever been acted upon by Government?

Mr. A. GOPALA MENON: I might say for the the information of the House that a number of recommendations of this Board has been accepted by Government and acted upon.

Mr. M. SIVATHANU PILLAI: Could the member name some of the recommendations so adopted?

Mr. A. GOPALA MENON: Marketing of coconut products is one. Rural re-construction scheme is another.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

MR. M. SIVATHANU PILLAI: As for that matter the rural reconstruction scheme was brought into being even before the existence of the Economic Development Board.

MR. A. GOPALA MENON: There is a standing committee of this Board which attends to the working of the scheme.

[At this stage the Dewan-President resumed the chair]

MR. K. P. KOCHUKORA THARAKAN : റസല്യൂഷൻ അക്സെപ്റ്റ് ചെയ്യുകയും അതിനെപ്പറ്റി എന്തെങ്കിലും പ്രവർത്തനം നടത്തിയിട്ടുണ്ടോ?

MR. A. GOPALA MENON : ഈ ചോദ്യത്തിന് ഒരു മറുപടി പറയുക വിഷമമാണ്. ഗവണ്മെൻറിനു ഒരു എക്കണോമിക്സ് ബോർഡ് മാത്രമല്ല ഉള്ളത്. ഓരോ കാര്യങ്ങളിലും ഉദ്യോഗസ്ഥന്മാരും അന്യോഗസ്ഥന്മാരും നിയമസഭയുടെയും മറ്റു പല സംഘടനകളും ഗവർമെൻറിനെ ഉപദേശിച്ചിട്ടുണ്ട്. ആരു പറഞ്ഞിട്ടാണ് ഗവർമ്മെൻറ് കാര്യങ്ങൾ ചെയ്യുന്നതെന്നു പറയാൻ വിഷമമാണ്.

MR. K. P. KOCHUKORATHARAKAN: മെമ്പർമാരെ വർദ്ധിപ്പിക്കുന്നതുകൊണ്ട് വലിയ പ്രയോജനമില്ലെന്നു ഗവണ്മെൻറിന് ഇപ്പോഴെങ്കിലും വന്നിട്ടുണ്ടോ?

MR. A. GOPALA MENON : ഇപ്പോഴത്തെ നിലയിൽ അങ്ങനെയാണു വിചാരിക്കുന്നത്.

MR. PULIYOOR T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI: May I know the amount that was set apart for the Economic Development Board for the year 1116?

MR. A. GOPALA MENON: Rs. 11,726 and odd.

MR. PULIYOOR T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI: May I know the amount utilised in the shape of T. A. for the members of the Board out of that amount?

MR. A. GOPALA MENON: That is not much, Rs. 8,364—Chs. 13—C. 14.

MR. KAINIKKARA M. PADMANABHA PILLAI: May I know whether any Development Department has sent up any proposal for the consideration of this Board?

MR. A. GOPALA MENON: Such proposals are bound up with Government proposals, and so it is not easy to say whether the Department itself has moved in the matter or not.

MR. KAINIKKARA M. PADMANABHA PILLAI: May I know whether Government have forwarded any proposal for the consideration of the Board?

MR. A. GOPALA MENON: Yes.

MR. KAINIKKARA M. PADMANABHA PILLAI: May I know the nature of the proposals sent? Will the honourable Member give some examples?

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

MR. A. GOPALA MENON : I am afraid I have not got a separate list of proposals forwarded by Government for consideration.

MR. KAINIKKARA M. PADMANABHA PILLAI : Is the member sure that any proposal was sent by Government ?

MR. A. GOPALA MENON : I have not got the list of subjects which Government actually forwarded. But many schemes such as Banking and Rural Re-construction schemes were discussed at the instance of Government.

MR. M. SIVATHANU PILLAI : May I know whether 32 was the number of members suggested by the original G. O. or whether it was subsequently increased ?

MR. A. GOPALA MENON : Government ordered the appointment of more members from time to time.

MR. M. SIVATHANU PILLAI : What I wish to know is whether that was the number in the G. O. originally constituting the Board.

MR. A. GOPALA MENON : The original G. O. relates to the year 1921.

MR. M. SIVATHANU PILLAI : What was the number then ? Was it not 11 and then subsequently raised ?

MR. A. GOPALA MENON : According to the needs of the time and according to the pressure brought to bear upon Government, that number had to be increased.

MR. M. SIVATHANU PILLAI : I suppose the Director of Public Instruction is a member of the Economic Development Board also.

MR A. GOPALA MENON : Yes, sir, at present.

MR. M. SIVATHANU PILLAI : May I know whether the members of that Committee ever travelled for T. A. alone ?

MR. A. GOPALA MENON : Not that I am aware of. T. A. came incidentally.

MR. PULIYOOR T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI : It is a matter for sincere gratification to find that an opportunity has been afforded to the Legislature to express its considered views on the question of re-organisation or re-constitution of the Economic Development Board. The Economic Development Board was constituted for the first time by virute of the G.O. dated 20th June 1921 and reorganised last in the year 1937. Thus we find that the Board has been in existence for the last two decades and that it has all along been traditionally keeping up its present constitution without any innovation except in regard to the increase in the number of its members from time to time. During this pretty long period of its existence, the Board has passed many hands in the sense that it has been tacked on to several Departmental Heads but not as adjunct to any particular Department. The first President of the Board, as I understand, was the Conservator of Forests. From him it devolved upon the Director of Agriculture and then again upon the Conservator of Forests. Afterwards it passed on to the Land Revenue and Income Tax Commissioner and lastly to the present President, the Director of Public Instruction. Thus it is not known

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. Puliyoor T. P. Velayudhan Pillai]

to the public or to this House as to what principle or policy has been followed by Government in regard to the appointment of its President. From what I have already submitted it can be seen that the Economic Development Board has no independent existence and that nobody was likely to take any special or permanent interest in the matter, the more so because of the honorary character of its Presidentship without any allowance or pay for the additional work.

MR. M. R. NARAYANA PILLAI: May I know what amount the member is proposing as allowance ?

MR. PULIYOOR T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI: I do not wish to answer that question.

The number of members was enhanced from time to time according to the exigencies of each occasion. The number, I belive, was 7 at one time according to the G. O. of 1921, and 13 at another time and 25 a third time according to the latest reorganisation. Now I am given to understand that it is between 30 and 32. From the Administration Report for the year 1115 it is seen that there are only 30 members. The Board as constituted at present is purely an Advisory Body without any executive functions. As evidenced by the Administration Report for the previous years, the Board used to pass several resolutions and submit the same to Government. But Sir, I was not able to see from the documents that have been furnished to us by Government what action Government have taken on those resolutions, or at least how far Government have appreciated them. Most of the resolutions passed by the Economic Development Board related to the agricultural problems. Instances are not rare in which the very same resolutions had come up for discussion at the meetings of both the Economic Development Board and the Agricultural Board. The two Boards constituted by Government, *viz.*, the Economic Development Board and the Board of Agriculture had to pass the very same resolutions. According to me it is a waste of public funds and public time. I am constrained to observe that in spite of the honest and repeated attempts made by Government and also by the present President in this direction, nothing substantial has been achieved so far as the result of the working of the Economic Development Board. One of the most important items of work now with the Board is to award grants to certain organisations started in the name of rural reconstruction. I may say without any hesitation that much criticism is levelled against the present system of awarding grants by the Economic Development Board. In my opinion the amount that is being annually spent by way of awarding grants to several organisations has not served any useful purpose and in or at least in some cases such grants are being misappropriated for their other needs by the individuals to whom the grant is given. It cannot but be so because even the President is not given powers or facilities to effectively control the organisations which are given such grants and to see that the money given by the Government is utilised for the purpose for which it is intended. In short I may be

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

permitted to submit that the name Economic Development Board itself is a misnomer in as much as there has been no economic policy or Development. I would venture to offer certain suggestions for the re-organisation of the Economic Development Board so that it may be made more useful or purposeful as the President has rightly stated on the floor of the House. As the present Board is quite unwieldy, I would suggest that it should be made a compact Advisory Body consisting of only experts on several subjects relating to the economic policy and undertakings of Government as a whole. Since there is at present a Board of Agriculture, a Co-operative Advisory Board and a Board of Industries, an unwieldy body like the present Economic Development Board would be a superfluous one.

PRESIDENT : In the course of the discussion it is open to the members to suggest the amalgamation or fusion of any existing bodies and also to suggest methods and means whereby non-official expert opinion can be made to be operative in such bodies in addition of official experts.

MR. PULIYOOR T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI : Sir, my submission is that I have no objection at present to allow the other boards except the Board of Agriculture to continue as they are just at present. My only submission is that the proposed re-organised Development Board must be only a central compact body consisting of experts only.

MR. KAINIKKARA M. PADMANABHA PILLAI : May I know the approximate number ?

MR. PULIYOOR T. P. VELAUDHAN PILLAI : According to me the number should not exceed 12. Even there, my submission is that it is not necessary that heads of development departments should be ex-officio members of the Board because Government are in a position even otherwise to ascertain the views, of these Departmental heads on different matters that come up for final decision before them.

MR. KAINIKKARA M. PADMANABHA PILLAI : Then who are the expert available ?

MR. PULIYOOR T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI : I don't think that only heads of departments are experts in such matters. There are ever so many other experts in different branches. According to the new rules of re-organisations the Dewan or the Chief Secretary should be bound to preside over the deliberations of the proposed re-organised Development Board so that they may be in direct touch with the trend of discussions at the meetings of the Board and also of the view points expressed by the members at such meetings. In other words my submission is that the Board may be enabled to function as a part of the Secretariat. Sir, in that case I am sure that the recommendation of the Economic Development Board will not be slightly brushed aside or allowed to remain without any action being taken. The reconstituted Economic Development Board must be of such a nature as would be in position to give useful advice to Government on major Economic problems and undertakings of Government and thus to make the Board more purposeful and useful. These are my suggestions and if such a

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. Puliyoor T. P. Velayudhaan Pilliai.]

board is constituted I fully believe it would be of substantial use to the general public and in any event I am not prepared to allow the Board to function on its present constitution.

PRESIDENT: Government will be very much grateful, if the functions and constitutions of some Body will take the place of the present Board or Boards and such functions are also indicated in this debate.

MR. M. R. NARAYANA PILLAI: Sir, I agree with the proposals of the honourable member who brought forward this motion. With reference to the last speaker—I mean my honourable friend Mr. T. P. Velayudhan Pillai—I cannot agree with his suggestion that only experts should be asked to serve as members of the Board. I am not in a position to agree with that because the Board should function more as a liaison agency between the public and the Government.

MR. M. L. JANARDANA PILLAI: Is not this Legislature such an agency?

MR. M. R. NARAYAN PILLAI: Sir, I am speaking about the functions of the Board and not of the Legislature. With regard to the Chief Secretary being made the President of the Board, I cannot agree with that suggestion either. The reason is that the President has to forward the recomendations of the Board to the Government, and the Chief Secretary is the officer on behalf of the Government to consider those recommendations. I know instances when officers like a late Conservator of Forests were Presidents of the Board and the resolutions passed by the Board presided over by the Conservator was not given effect to when he reached his office. He would simply refuse to take action on them for many reasons, therefore an officer of Government or a head of a department should not be made the President of the Board. The present president of the Board is the fittest person to be the president. He is an authority on the subject of economics and he has travelled wide and knows the conditions outside.

MR. M. SIVATHANU PILLAI: Even after he retires should he be the President?

MR. M. R. NARAYANA PILLAI: There is no harm in that.

MR. P. SIVARAMA PILLAI: Sir, the Economic Development Board has been in existence for more than twenty years. In the G. O. reconstituting the Board in 1937, the Government observed as follows:—

> "Government consider that the Board should be reconstituted so as to make it a really representative organisation, representing the economic interests in the State and comprising only those who can advise Government with authority backed by experience. It should function through sub-committees each of which should consist of three or, at the most, five members. Its object must be to help Government in bringing about well-conceived schemes of economic planning spread over a few years. The Board should not fritter away its attention on a large number of questions, but should pick out a few which are considered most urgent and important. Each one of these problems should be left to a sub-committee of the Board, instead of the whole Board, sitting over it. There cannot be more than three or four such problems in any one year."

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Accordingly the Board was reconstituted with 15 non-official members and 10 official members. This new Board has now been functioning for more than four years. We find that during this period the Board has discussed various matters of economic importance and made recommendations to the Government. I understand that the Government has accepted and acted upon some of these recommendations. Thus it has been functioning as a poor advisory body. Among the functions of the Board has been included co-ordination of the work of the several development departments. But I do not know how far the object of the Government has been realised so far. The heads of the Development Departments should take more interest in the working of the Board and the carrying out of the schemes recommended by the Board.

But, Sir, the utility of the Board would have been much more if it were given a hand in and a supervision over the actual working out of the schemes by the various develop ment departments. The Board as at present constituted is too large. So it should be made a more compact and homogeneous body consisting of the heads of Development Departments and a few real experts. The number should not be more han a dozen. Such a compact body will be able to meet more often han at present and effectively plan for the future.

I believe that an amount of duplication and overlapping of functions of several bodies like the Board of Agriculture can be avoided by the amalgamation of these two Boards. It is just the proper time for us to consider whether all these Boards should continue to work on the present line.

MR. KAINIKKARA M. PADMANABHA PILLAI: Sir, I do not think that there has been much difference of opinion as to the work turned out so far by the Economic Development Board. The very fact that Government have thought it proper to move a motion to enable this House to discuss the question fully shows that the turn out of work by the Board has not been satisfactory. The President himself has expressed in very decent language that the work has not been quite what it was expected to be. Therefore the present constitution of the Board and the work turned out so far, I do not think, will get the approval of anybody either of Government or the non-officials. The President in moving the motion has placed before us a rough skeleton of a programme for the future. I may say, Sir, that I am generally in agreement with the programme as chalked out by him. If I have understood him correctly the future programme is to reduce the number of members and make the Board a more compact body with a constitution having a non-official majority and work it through certain sub-committees. I think, that this is the sum total of his proposals. I may say, Sir, that I am generally in agreement with the programme stated by him.

It has been said here that the committee must be a committee of experts. It has also been said here that the departmental heads might not necessarily be in the committee. I cannot possibly conceive of a

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. Kainikkara M. Padmanabha Pillai]

committee of experts in Travancore excluding departmental heads. For example I do not think that we can have a great expert in Agriculture than the Director of Agriculture. Or for that matter there may not be a better authority on industrial matters than the Director of Industries. Naturally the heads of departments are the best experts available to Government for any purpose. If the Committee wants to be a committee of experts the departmental heads must be given a place in it. I would go a step further and say that even if it is not a Committee of experts the departmental heads will have to be there. I have one particular point to emphasise viz., the necessity for the co-relation and co-ordination of the departments. I think the departmental heads should be members of a body like this. To me the conception of a board is more of an executive nature. It should not merely be a Committee of experts working in a laboratory and giving out formulas for the economic development of our State. When expert advice is necessary competent hands can be co-opted and their advice availed of.

Another point which I want to emphasise is this. My friend Mr. T. P. Velayudhan Pillai was saying that he is for allowing the other boards to continue. I am definitely against this. The moment we reconstitute the Economic Development Board and make it efficient, I think we can immediately do away with the Agricultural Board. There is a co-operative advisory committee now, but I am afraid that the members are not correctly informed about that. It is not a standing committee. It has been established only for a period of 3 months. The present committee may recommend a standing committee. However when the reconstituted Economic Development Board comes into being I think a permanent co-operative Advisory Committee would also become unnecessary. Sir, in this connection I would go a step further and say that the Public Works Advisory Committee can also be done away with. The functions of all these committees can be fulfilled by the sub-committees of the newly constituted Economic Development Board. Therefore in my opinion a compact, efficient and ever vigilant board is the only necessary institution.

Sir, a suggestion has been made here that the Dewan or the Chief Secretary must preside over the deliberations of its meetings. It has got its own use. If the departmental head or the Chief Secretary comes into close contact with the deliberations of the Committee and happens to know the opinions expressed there certainly it would make matttters easy for carrying them out. But I would consider that a separate president is necessary for this Development Board. Sir, the objects with which this development board was formed needs no revision. It is exhaustive and the scope of work is quite wide. Its first object is "to discuss all questions of policy relating to the working of the various development departments". The second function is "to make suggestions to Government in regard to the agricultural, industrial and other matters of economic importance and to co-ordinate the

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

work of the several development departments". Thirdly it has "to discuss important proposals or schemes sent up by each individual development board or Government." These three functions are certainly wide enough and is more or less exhaustive for all practical purposes. But it is clear that none of these functions have been quite satisfactorily carried out. The first of these three objects is perhaps the only item attended to, namely, sending up recommendations to Government. Even there, we are told, that even though Government found their way to accept some of the recommendations sent up to them, when it came to a question of carrying them out only very few of the recommendations were given effect to. About the third point, I would ask the president whether there has been any single instance of work of this kind done by the Economic Development Board. Government or the various development departments have very few occasions to refer any matter of importance to the Economic Development Board. So far that clause has never been put into operation. Coming to the second aim viz., to co-ordinate the work of the several departments I have to say something about this point.

Throughout my life as a member of the Assembly I have felt that much remains to be done in this direction. We have got the Department of Industries, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Co-operation and the rural development activities —though it has not become a department with a departmental head. Thus we have got various departments. All these departments are necessary for the development of the country. But, unless they are inter-related and some effective correlation is made between these departments, they are not going to give substantial development to the economic condition of this country. Two years ago Government set apart 50 thousand rupees for rural uplift work in the Budget. In the general discussion of the Budget I said that it was not going to make any substantial contribution towards the rural uplift of the country unless a co-relation was effected between the several departments contributing to rural uplift and the whole thing was brought under one officer. Now, Sir, take for example the question of manure. In the case of manure co-operation between the Fisheries Department, the Agricultural Department and the Forest Department is necessary. So, again take for example, the cottage industries. Co-operation between the Agricultural Department, Co-operative Department and Industries Department is necessary. Again take the question of irrigation. Co-operation between Land Revenue Department, Agricultural Department and the Department of Public Works is necessary. Thus we find when we go deep into any problem an inter-relation between several Departments is necessary. Without provision for that I do not think that this is going to have any great influence on the economic condition of the country in general. Of course, the Industrial Department may be able to show some work; the Agricultural Department may be able to publish a spectacular administration report. But the ordinary citizen will not be benefited to any considerable extent.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. Kainikkara M. Padmanabha Pillai]

The essential object of the Economic Development Board must therefore be to co-ordinate the work of the several Departments—I believe that can be achieved only by the appointment of an efficient Development Commissioner, if I may call him so. There must be separate heads of the Departments for co-operation, of Agriculture, Industries etc. But in addition to their own individual work these departments must work as a correlated whole. The only effective method of fulfilling the aims of the Economic Development Board is to co-relate these departments, and that can be done only by bringing them under an officer of high status whom I may call the Development Commissioner.

To me, therefore, Sir, whether the Chief Secretary presides or the Dewan presides is not exactly the most important question. I would urge that the President of the Economic Development Board must be the Development Commissioner.

Now, to summarise my remarks, I would suggest that the Board must be reconstituted so that the heads of the various development departments are given places in that. Substantial weightage must be given to the non-official element. The Board should be placed under a Development Commissioner who would co-relate the activities of the various Departments. A programme should be chalked out. The Committee will carry out its different functions by constituting themselves into small sub-committees.

MR. T. C. KESAVA PILLAI: സർ, ഈ ഉപക്ഷേപത്തെപ്പറ്റി രണ്ടു വാക്കു പറയണമെന്നു ഞാനും വിചാരിക്കുന്നു. ഞാൻ എക്കണോമിക്കു ബോർഡിലെ ഒരു പ്രതിനിധിയാണു്. കഴിഞ്ഞ കാലങ്ങളിലെ പ്രവർത്തനം നോക്കുമ്പോൾ ബോർഡുമുഖേന വളരെ പ്രധാനപ്പെട്ട കാര്യങ്ങളെപ്പറ്റി ചർച്ച ചെയ്യുവാൻ കഴിഞ്ഞു എന്നും കാര്യങ്ങൾ വളരെ ഭംഗിയായി നടത്തിക്കൊണ്ടു പോയി എന്നും പറയുവാൻ കഴിയും. ലാൻഡ് റവന്യൂ കമ്മിണറന്മാരായ മെ. കെ. ജാർജ്ജ്, രാമചന്ദ്രറാവു മുതലായവരുടെ സാന്നിദ്ധ്യവും ഉപദേശവും ഉണ്ടായിരുന്ന ആ കാലത്തു ബോർഡ് പ്രയോജനകരമായ പലതും പ്രവർത്തിച്ചിട്ടുണ്ടു്. എക്കണോമിക്ക് സംബന്ധിച്ചു് വളരെ വൈദഗദ്ധ്യം സമ്പാദിച്ചിട്ടുള്ള ഇന്നത്തെ അദ്ധ്യക്ഷനും ബോർഡിൽ വിലയേറിയ സേവനമാണു് നടത്തിയിട്ടുള്ളതു. എക്കണോമിക്ക് ബോർഡിൽ നിന്നും ഒന്നോ രണ്ടോ പ്രമേയം മാത്രമെ ഗവർമെൻറിൽ അയക്കാവൂ. ഏതായാലും വളരെ പ്രയോജനമുള്ള ഈ ബോർഡിനെ നിരുത്തൽ ചെയ്യരുതെന്നും കഴിയുന്നതു പരിഷ്കരിച്ചു കൂടുതൽ പ്രയോജനപ്രദമാക്കിത്തീർക്കണമെന്നുമാണു് എനിക്കു പറയാനുള്ളതു്. ഗവർമെൻറു കർഷകരുടെ കാര്യത്തിൽ എപ്പോഴും സദുദ്ദേശത്തോടു കൂടിയാണു് പെരുമാറിയിട്ടുള്ളതു്. എന്നാൽ ഡിപ്പാർട്ടുമെൻറുകൾ തമ്മിലുള്ള സ്വരച്ചേർച്ചയുടെ കുറവുകൊണ്ടോ എന്തോ ചില

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

കുഴപ്പങ്ങൾ ഉണ്ടാകുന്നുണ്ട്. ഈ ബോർഡിനെ ശക്തിപ്പെടുത്താമെങ്കിൽ ഇത്തരം കുഴപ്പങ്ങൾ പരിഹരിക്കാവുന്നതാണ്. അതുകൊണ്ട് ഒരു എക്സിക്യൂട്ടീവ് ബാഡിയാക്കി— ഏകനിക്യൂട്ടിവ് കൗൺസിലല്ല— ഇതിനെ രൂപാന്തരപ്പെടുത്തി ഗവർമ്മെൻറിന്റെ നിയന്ത്രണത്തിൽ പ്രവർത്തിക്കുവാൻ വ്യവസ്ഥ ചെയ്യണം

MR. THAMARAPALLIL KOCHU THOMMEN (*Tiruvalla*): അതുകൊണ്ടു ഉത്തരവാദഭരണം ഇവിടെ ഏർപ്പെടുത്തണമെന്നാണോ മെമ്പർ പറയുന്നത്?

MR. T. C. KESAVA PILLAI: എനിക്ക് ചെങ്ങന്നൂർ ഭാഷയിൽസംസാരിക്കാൻ വശമില്ല.

സർ, ഉത്തരവാദഭരണം വേണമോ എന്ന സ്നേഹിതൻ മി. കൊച്ചുതൊമ്മൻ ചോദിക്കുന്നു. ഞാൻചെങ്ങന്നൂർകാരനല്ല. തെക്കൻതിരുവിതാംകൂർകാരനാണ്. ചെങ്ങന്നൂർക്കാർക്കാണ് ഉത്തരവാദഭരണത്തോട് കൂടുതൽ ആഗ്രഹമുള്ളത്. ഗവണ്മെൻറിനോടുത്തരവാദപ്പെട്ട ഒരുഉപദേശകക്കമ്മറ്റി, വേണമെന്നാണ്ഞാൻ പറഞ്ഞത്. പി. ഡബ്ലൂ., ട്രാൻസ്പോർട്ട്, കോപ്പറേറ്റീവ് ഇങ്ങനെയുള്ള അഡൈ്വസറി ബോർഡുകളെല്ലാം കൂട്ടിച്ചേർത്തു ഒരൊറ ബോർഡാക്കുവാനും വിദഗ്ദ്ധന്മാരും ഫൈനാൻഷ്യൽ സെക്രട്ടറി, ചീഫ് സെക്രട്ടറി തുടങ്ങിയ ഉദ്യോഗസ്ഥന്മാരും മെമ്പറന്മാരായി വേണ്ട ഉപദേശങ്ങൾ നൽകുവാൻ ബഡ്ജറ്റ് മീറ്റിംഗിനു മുമ്പ് ഒന്നോ രണ്ടോ മീറ്റിംഗുകൾ കൂടുവാനും വ്യവസ്ഥചെയ്യു, ബോർഡിനെ കൂടുതൽ പരിഷ്കരിക്കണം എന്നാണ് എന്റെ അഭിപ്രായം.

MR. M. L. JANARDANA PILLAI: Sir, I am sorry I cannot entirely agree with the statement made in this House that the Economic Development Board has not been functioning very satisfactorily. To say that it has not been functioning as satisfactorily as it should have functioned, is entirely different from saying that it has not functioned satisfactorily.

The first Economic Development Board was constituted during the Dewanship of Mr. T. Raghavia with a view to advise Government about matters connected with Commerce and Industry. One such was the Thuckalai Sugar Factory when Mr. Ananda Rao took it up. The Board told Government very clearly that the terms put forward by the applicant were wrong on business principles and should not be accepted. But what was the result? A few months afterwards Mr. Ananda Rao's proposals were accepted in their entirety. That is one of the many things that I wish to bring to the notice of this House. Similarly I may mention that in the first Economic Development Board, the Board protested against Government granting mining

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. M. L. Janardana Pillai]

leases for Ilmenite and monozite. The Board on its own initiative informed Government that this should not be allowed. But what was the result? Immediately afterwards a number of licencees obtained licenses. The E. D. Board was told by Government that it was only an advisory body. The question naturally arises why should it be called an advisory body when that body's advice is not at all accepted. That is one side of the picture.

The other side of the picture was put forward by Mr. Kainikkara Padmanabha Pillai who said that the Board had ample opportunities of doing good work and that the G. O. constituting the Board covered every possible field of human activities. Paragraph 3 refers to the consideration of important proposals and schemes sent up by individual departments and Government and making recommendations thereon. But lower down in the rules Government say that the Government shall not initiate any new economic policy without consulting it. But what was the state of affairs in actual practice may be Government asked the Board's opinion on some proposals but, invariably Government never consulted the Board before initiating any new economic policy. Nor did the heads of departments ever care to consult the Board.

MR. PUTHUPPALLI S. KRISHNA PILLAI: May I be permitted to suggest another reason why in practice it was not being done? Almost all the heads of the Development Departments are members of the Board, such as, the Director of Agriculture and the Director of Industries. Before Government sanction any scheme their opinions are being taken then and there.

MR. M. L. JANARDANA PILLAI: Of course, they are members. But that is quite different from saying that the Board should consider important schemes before Government should initiate new economic policy. The members should certainly be given an opportunity of considering important measures connected with Agriculture, Industry and Economics. I will just mention some of the subjects on which the Board sent up recommendations to Government. They sent up proposals concerning shipping facilities, trade agencies, compilation of statistics and rationalisation of the coir industry. In these matters naturally only a few of the members were taking interest because they were personally well informed on those subjects. Then came another set of subjects on which also the Board sent up its proposals to Government, such as the consolidation of Agricultural holdings, use of hand-pounded rice, conservation of grazing ground, hire-purchase system for Agricultural implements, conservation of monsoon water, enquiry into the forest policy of the State, special allotment for minor irrigation works, etc. The E. D. Board which should deal with the industries and commerce of the country, and which according to the Government order ought to consist of people with export experience in industries and commerce, finally descended itself to discussions of these

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

questions which could very appropriately be discussed by the Agricultural Board. In my opinion the E. D. Board should confine its attention entirely to the commerce and industry of this State, especially as we shall soon be confronted with postwar problems relating to commerce and industry. The E. D. Board should in my opinion be a compact body of experts, not more than 4 or 5, and that their recommendations must produce tangible results at the hands of Government. This principle has yet not been acted upon. It is due to the fact that it is an unwieldy body. Therefore I would suggest for the consideration of this House and the Government that a full time officer, you may call him Development Commissioner or by any other name, should be the President of the Board, and the number of members should not be more than 4 or 5, and they should all be men who have got expert knowledge in the industries and commerce which they represent. The recommendations of such a small body must certainly be given weight to by Government. Otherwise the usual method would be followed and the men who are working in that Board will lose heart. Formerly, in this Board, Mr. Lampard was a member; in the second Board, Mr. Pollard was a member; and in the next Board, Mr. Hill was a member. Sometimes even useful recommendations of those Boards were often check-mated and nullified by discussions initiated on such questions as hand-pounded rice &c. If the Government are serious of re-constituting the E. D. Board it must deal with only questions relating to commerce and industries, and a gentleman having expert knowledge and long and practical experience in industries and commerce and with the requisite acadamical qualifications should be appointed to be the head of this Board. If such a man could not be had here, I personally would not have any objection to importing an outsider. The E. D. Board should function in the same way as the Tarriff Board in British India functions. If such a re-constitution is not made, after 5 or 6 years the same cries will be heard on the floor of this House.

MR. KOTTALIL P. ABRAHAM: May I know why the member desires to exclude agricultural subjects from the E. D. Board?

MR. M. L. JANARDANA PILLAI: According to me, those subjects could be discussed in the Agricultural Board.

MR. K. DOMINIC JOSEPH: Is it the member's opinion that agriculture does not play an important part in the development of the country?

MR. M. L. JANARDANA PILLAI: It does, but it need not play any important part in the Economic Development Board.

MR. N. NARAYANA KURUP: Sir, I too desire to make a few observations on this motion. It has been found by experience that the E. D. Board as constituted at present is an unwieldy body which has not been able to do better work for the Economic Development of the State. There is no doubt that an Economic Development Board is necessary for our State. I suggest that the number of members should never be more than 15. It is a matter for consideration whether it should be an

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. N. Narayana Kurup.]

expert committee on the lines suggested by Mr. T. P. Velayudhan Pillai or a committee, as suggested by an honourable member, to take up the functions of all the committees in the State, such as the Text Book Committee, the Public Service Advisory Committee, the Agriculture Board and other committees. I cannot in fact, conceive of such a committee. We cannot amalgamate such committees, the amalgamation of which will look like a mixture of water, milk and gram. The Agricultural Board and the E. D. Board which do more or less similar functions may be amalgamated. I am therefore in perfect agreement with the scheme suggested by the President of the E. D. Board in his speech.

MR. PULIYOOR T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI: Sir, in order to make certain definite recommendations to Government, I may be permitted to move a specific motion containing such recommendations for the acceptance of this House. I move that the E. D. Board be re-constituted :

(*a*) by reducing the number of members to 12, of which not more than 4 shall be officials ;

(*b*) by amalgamating with it the Agricultural Board : and

(*c*) by co-opting from time to time such members as are in the opinion of the Board necessary in connection with the matters that may be under the consideration of the Board.

Sir, I move this motion for the consideration of the House.

MR. P. S. MUHAMMED: മി. വേലായുധൻപിള്ള അവതരിപ്പിച്ച ഈ മോഷനെ ഞാൻ പിൻതാങ്ങുന്നതോടുകൂടി എക്കണോമിക്ക് ഡവലപ്പ്മെൻറ് ബോർഡിന്റെ പ്രവർത്തനത്തെപ്പറ്റി രണ്ടു വാക്കുപറയണമെന്നു വിചാരിക്കുന്നു. ബോർഡ് അതിന്റെ ആരംഭഘട്ടങ്ങളിൽ കുറച്ചുകാലം വളരെ നല്ല പ്രവർത്തനങ്ങൾ നടത്തിയിട്ടുണ്ടെന്നാണ് എന്റെ വിചാരം. ഇത്ര അധികം മെമ്പറന്മാർ അതിനു ആദ്യകാലത്തുണ്ടായിരുന്നില്ല. പത്തോപതിനൊന്നോ മെമ്പറന്മാരേ ഉണ്ടായിരുന്നുള്ളൂ. അപ്പോൾ ബോർഡുമുഖേന കാര്യമായ ചിലനിർദ്ദേശങ്ങൾ ഗവണ്മെൻറിന്റെ ശ്രദ്ധയിൽ കൊണ്ടുവരപ്പെട്ടിട്ടുണ്ടെന്ന് എനിക്കറിയാം. അന്നു മെമ്പറന്മാരായിരുന്നവരിൽ പലരും കാര്യമായ ചില അഭിപ്രായങ്ങൾ രേഖപ്പെടുത്തുകയും ചെയ്തിട്ടുണ്ട്. ആദ്യകാലത്തു് ഗവണ്മെൻറ് സ്വീകരിച്ചിട്ടുള്ളതും സ്വീകരിക്കാതിരുന്നിട്ടുള്ളതും ആയബോർഡിന്റെ ശുപാർശകളെ പ്രത്യേകമായി വേർതിരിച്ചിട്ടുണ്ട്. അതു നോക്കിയാൽ അവയിൽ പലതും ഗവണ്മെൻറ് സ്വീകരിച്ചിട്ടുണ്ടെന്നു കാണാം.

MR. KOTTALIL. P. ABRAHAM : On a point of order, Sir, I wish to know whether Mr. Gopala Menon's motion or Mr. Velayudhan Pillai's motion is now before the House.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

PRESIDENT: You must now take it that as a result of Mr. Gopala Menon's motion, a proposal which may be regarded as an amendment has been brought forward. And it is open to the House to consider the amendment and the proposal together, but the voting might be taken separately.

MR. P. S. MUHAMMED: അന്ന ഓരോ ഡിപ്പാർട്ടുമെൻറിനും ഓരോ ഉപദേശകസമിതികൾ ഉള്ളതുപോലെ ഈ ബോർഡ് ഡവലപ്പു മെൻറ് ഡിപ്പാർട്ടുമെൻറിന്റെ ഉപദേശക സമിതിയായിത്തീർന്നിരിക്കുകയാണ്. ഇപ്പോൾ മെമ്പറന്മാരുടെ സംഖ്യകൾ വർദ്ധിപ്പിച്ചു. അതു ഈ ബോർഡിന്റെ ഉദ്ദേശസാദ്ധ്യത്തിനു പ്രതിബന്ധമായിത്തീരുകയും ചെയ്യും. ഈ കാര്യം ഗവണ്മെൻറു മനസിലാക്കി അതിനു പരിഹാരം ഉണ്ടാക്കുന്നതിനു വേണ്ടിയാണ് അതിന്റെ പ്രസിഡൻറു ഈ മോഷൻ അവതരിപ്പിച്ചതു്. കാര്യമായ പ്രവർത്തനത്തിനു മെമ്പറന്മാരുടെ സംഖ്യ കുറഞ്ഞിരിക്കുകയാണു് നല്ലതു്. പത്തൊ പതിനൊന്നോ മെമ്പറന്മാരിൽ കൂടുതൽ ഒരിക്കലും നന്നായിരിക്കുകയില്ല. അതിന്റെ പ്രസിഡൻറ് ഒരു പൂർണ്ണമായും പ്രവർത്തകനായിരിക്കണമെന്നു പറയുന്നതിനോടു് എനിക്കു യോജിപ്പില്ല. പല കമ്മിറ്റികളുടെയും പ്രസിഡൻറായിരിക്കത്തക്കവിധത്തിൽ ഒരു ഉദ്യോഗസ്ഥനെ നിയമിക്കുക എന്നു പറയുന്നതു് ഒരു വലിയ സംഖ്യ ചെലവാക്കുക എന്നു പറയുന്നതിനോടു തുല്യമായിരിക്കും. നേരേമറിച്ചു് ഇന്നു് ഡവലപ്പ്മെൻറ് ഡിപ്പാർട്ടുമെൻറിനോടു് ബന്ധമുള്ള ഡിപ്പാർട്ടുമെൻറദ്ധ്യക്ഷന്മാരിൽ ഏതെങ്കിലും ഒരാളിനെ ഒരു അലവൻസ് കൊടുത്തു നിയമിക്കുന്നതായിരിക്കും ഏറ്റവും പ്രായോഗികമായിട്ടുള്ളതു. അഗ്രികൾച്ചർ, ഇൻഡസ്ട്രി, കോമേഴ്സ്, കോവാപ്പറേഷൻ, റവന്യൂ റീകൺസ്ട്രക്ഷൻ ഇതുമായിരിക്കും ഡവലപ്പ്മെൻറ് ബോർഡിന്റെ പരിധിക്കകത്തു വരുന്ന സംഗതികൾ. ഈ ഡിപ്പാർട്ടുമെൻറുകളെല്ലാം ഉൾപ്പെടത്തക്കനിലയിലായിരിക്കണം ഡവലപ്പ്മെൻറ് ബോർഡ് തുടങ്ങിക്കൊണ്ടുപോകേണ്ടതു്. എന്റെ സ്നേഹിതൻ മി. ജനാർദ്ദനപിള്ള ഇൻഡസ്ട്രിയും കാമേഴ്സും മാത്രമേ ഡവലപ്പ്മെൻറുബോർഡിൽ ഉൾപ്പെടുത്താവൂഎന്നു പറയുകയുണ്ടായി. അങ്ങനെയാണെങ്കിൽ ഡവലപ്പ്മെൻറു ബോർഡു തന്നെ നിറുത്തി ട്രാൻസ്പോർട്ടിനും പി. ഡബ്ളിയു. ഡിക്കും മറ്റും ഉള്ളതുപോലെ ഇൻഡസ്ട്രിക്കും കാമേഴ്സിനുംകൂടി ഒരു അഡ്വൈസറി ബോർഡു ഏർപ്പെടുത്തിയാൽ മതിയാകും. ഡവലപ്പ്മെൻറു ബോർഡു കാര്യമായി വല്ലതും പ്രവർത്തിക്കണമെന്നുണ്ടെങ്കിൽ ഇന്നത്തെ നിലയിൽനിന്നും അതിനെ പരിഷ്കരിക്കേണ്ടതാണ്.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

MR. K. P. KOCHUKORA THARAKAN: സർ, എക്കണോമിക്ക് ബോർഡിലെ എണ്ണം കുറയ്ക്കണമെന്നുള്ള അഭിപ്രായത്തോട് ഞാനും യോജിക്കുന്നു. എന്നാൽ അംഗങ്ങളെ തിരഞ്ഞെടുക്കുമ്പോൾ പ്രാപ്തിയും യോഗ്യതയും ഉള്ളവരായ ആളുകളെ മാത്രമെ തിരഞ്ഞെടുക്കാവൂ എന്ന് എനിക്കഭിപ്രായമുണ്ട്. ഏതെങ്കിലും തരത്തിൽ പ്രയോജനപ്പെടുന്നുണ്ടെന്നു ഗവണ്മെൻറിനു ബോദ്ധ്യപ്പെട്ടാൽ ബോർഡിന്റെ നിശ്ചയങ്ങളും അഭിപ്രായങ്ങളും, സാധാരണപോലെ പവറുകുട്ടയിൽ തള്ളുകയില്ല. യോഗ്യന്മാരായ ആളുകൾ ആഡംബരത്തിനുവേണ്ടിതന്നെ ആയാലും എന്തെങ്കിലും തീരുമാനംചെയ്തു ഗവണ്മെൻറിലേയ്ക്കു അയച്ചാൽ ഗവണ്മെൻറിനു അതെല്ലാം സ്വീകരിക്കുവാൻ നിവൃത്തിയില്ലല്ലോ. ഫ ഇ-ൽ കൂടാതെയും ഫ ഠ-ൽ കുറയാതെയും ഉള്ള അംഗങ്ങൾ ബോർഡിൽ ഉണ്ടായിരിക്കുന്നതു നന്നായിരിക്കും. സാമാന്യം എല്ലാ വിഷയത്തിലും പ്രാവീണ്യവും വൈദഗ്ദ്ധ്യവും ഉള്ളവരുടെ ഒരു സമിതിയായിരിക്കണം ഈ ബോർഡ്. അവർ ധനപരിപോഷണവിഷയത്തിൽ ഗവണ്മെൻറിനെ ഉപദേശിക്കുകയും സഹായിക്കുകയും ചെയ്യാൻ ഉള്ള കഴിവും മനസ്സും സൌകര്യവും ഉള്ളവരായിരിക്കുകയും വേണം. കൃഷിവിഷയത്തിനു അഗ്രിക്കൾച്ചറൽ ബോർഡുണ്ടെന്നും അതുകൊണ്ടു ഡവലപ്പ്മെൻറ് ബോർഡിൽ അതിനെപ്പറ്റി ഒന്നും പറയേണ്ടെന്നും മി: ജനാർദ്ദനൻപിള്ള പറഞ്ഞതിൽ എനിക്കു അത്ഭുതമില്ല. അലപ്പുഴയിൽ താമസിക്കുന്ന അദ്ദേഹത്തിനു കൃഷിവിഷയത്തിൽ അതുകൊള്ളാം താൽപ്പര്യമേ ഉള്ളൂ. കൃഷിസംബന്ധമായ കാര്യങ്ങൾക്കും മറ്റുള്ള ഉപദേശസമിതികൾ നിറുത്തി ഡവലപ്പ്മെൻറ് ബോർഡിനെ വേണ്ടവിധം പരിഷ്കരിക്കുന്ന പക്ഷം പ്രവർത്തനസൌകര്യം കുറെക്കൂടി ഉണ്ടായിരിക്കുന്നതാണു്. ഒരു കമ്മീഷണറെ നിയമിക്കുക എന്നു പറയുന്നതിനോടു് എനിക്കു യോജിക്കുവാൻ നിവൃത്തിയില്ല. പല ഡിപ്പാർട്ടുമെൻറ് മേധാവികളുമായി യോജിച്ചു് ആലോചിച്ചു് പ്രവൃത്തിക്കുന്ന ആ ഉദ്യോഗസ്ഥൻ ഒരു ഫസ്റ്റ് ഗ്രെയിഡ് ഉദ്യോഗസ്ഥനായിരിക്കണം. ആ നിലയിൽ ഒരു ഫസ്റ്റ് ഗ്രെയിഡ് ഉദ്യോഗംകൂടെ തൽക്കാലം സൃഷ്ടിക്കേണ്ടതാവശ്യം ഞാൻ കാണുന്നില്ല. അതിന്റെ ആവശ്യവുമില്ല. ഇന്നു ഉള്ളവരിൽ കൊള്ളാവുന്ന ഒരു ഫസ്റ്റ് ഗ്രെയിഡ് ഉദ്യോഗസ്ഥനെക്കൊണ്ടുതന്നെ ഇക്കാര്യം വഹിക്കാവുന്നതാണു്. അദ്ദേഹത്തിനു ഒരു അലവൻസ് കൊടുത്താൽ മതി. ഇങ്ങനെ ഉപദേശകസമിതികളെ വച്ചിരിക്കുന്നതുകൊണ്ടുമാത്രം ഒരു പ്രയോജനവുമില്ല. അവരുടെ ശുപാർശകളെ ഉടനടി സ്വീകരിക്കുകയോ അല്ലെങ്കിൽ തള്ളിക്കളയുക

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

യൊ ചെയ്യണം. തള്ളിക്കളയുന്നെങ്കിൽ അതിനുള്ള കാരണവും പറയണം. അങ്ങനെ ചെയ്താൽ ആവശ്യമില്ലാത്ത ശുപാർശകൾ ചെയ്യുകയില്ല. അംഗീകരിക്കുന്നവയെ ശരിയായ പ്രവർത്തനത്തിൽ കൊണ്ടുവരികയും വേണം. അതിനാൽ ഗവണ്മെൻറിന്റെ പ്രവർത്തനത്തെ ആശ്രയിച്ചാണ് ഡവലപ്പ്മെൻറ് ബോർഡിന്റെയും മറ്റുപദേശ സമതികളുടെയും പ്രവർത്തനം ഇരിക്കുന്നത്. ആഗ്രികൾച്ചറൽബോർഡിൽ, കനകാലിതീറിക്കുള്ള മേച്ചിൽസ്ഥലങ്ങൾ പതിച്ചു കൊടുക്കുന്നതിനുള്ള അധികാരം റവന്യൂഡിപ്പാർട്ടുമെൻറിൽ ഇരിക്കുന്നതുകൊണ്ട് ടി കനകാലി തീറിസ്ഥലങ്ങൾ പതിച്ചുകൊടുക്കുന്നതിനിടയാകുന്നുണ്ടെന്നും അപ്രകാരം മേലാൽ സംഭവിക്കാതിരിക്കാൻ വേണ്ടി അഗ്രികൾച്ചറൽ ഡിപ്പാർട്ടുമെൻറിലേക്കു വിട്ടുകൊടുക്കണമെന്നു തീരുമാനിച്ച് ഗവണ്മെൻറിലേക്കു ശുപാർശചെയ്യുകയുണ്ടായി. ബോർഡിനു ഈ കാര്യത്തെപ്പറ്റിയുള്ള അനുഭവങ്ങൾ വ്യക്തമായി മനസ്സിലാക്കാൻ കഴിഞ്ഞതിനു ശേഷമാണ് ഇങ്ങനെ ഒരു തീരുമാനംചെയ്തതും ഗവണ്മെൻറിലേയ്ക്കു ശുപാർശചെയ്തതും. എന്നാൽ അതു ഇതുവരെ നടപ്പിൽ വരുത്തിയിട്ടില്ല. ഇപ്പോൾ എന്തെങ്കിലും ചെയ്യണം, എന്തെങ്കിലും പറയണം എന്നുള്ള ഒരു നിലയാണ് ബോർഡിനുള്ളതു്. ഗവണ്മെൻറും ഉപദേശകസമതികളുടെ ശുപാർശകളിൽ വേണ്ടവിധം ശ്രദ്ധപതിച്ചു കാണുന്നില്ലെന്നു പറയാതെ തരമില്ല. ഇത്തരം ബോർഡുകളെ സംബന്ധിച്ചിടത്തോളമുള്ള ഗവണ്മെൻറിന്റെ ഈ നില മാറണം. ഉപദേശകസമിതികൾ വേണ്ടതു പ്രയോജനപ്രദമാകുന്നില്ലെങ്കിൽ അതിനു മേൽപറഞ്ഞകാരണങ്ങളിൽ ഗവണ്മെൻറിനെയാണ് കൂടുതൽ കുറപ്പെടുത്താനുള്ളതു്. ഇതുയും സംഗതികൾ ഗവണ്മെൻറിന്റെ ശ്രദ്ധയിൽ കൊണ്ടുവന്നുകൊണ്ട് ഞാൻ ഈ ഉപക്ഷേപത്തെ അനുകൂലിക്കുന്നു.

MR. M. L. JANARDANA PILLAI: I beg to move an amendment to Mr. T. P. Velayudhan Pillai's resolution to the following effect :—

"But the President of the Board shall be a full-time officer for three years and the number of members shall not be more than 6 excluding the President."

PRESIDENT: Does the member want to support the same by argument.

MR. M. L. JANARDANA PILLAI: Not necessary Sir.

MR. D. FRANCIS (*Kalkulam cum Vilavancode*): Sir, எக்னமிக் டெவலெப்மென்று போர்டு பிரஸிடெண்டி அவர்கள் அவதரிப்பித்த பிரமேயத்தை அனுകൂലിക്കിന്നേൻ. അതിൽ മെമ്പർകളായിരുക്കക കൂടിയവർകൾ എക്സ്പെർട്ട്സുകളായിരുക്കവേണ്ടുമെന്നു ചില മെമ്പർകൾ சொன்னதையും ആമോദിക്കിന്നേൻ. ആനാൽ എക്സ്பர்ட்ஸ் என்பவர்கள் யார்? எதில்

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. D. Francis.]

எல்லாம் எக்ஸ்பர்ட்ஸ் என்பது அறியவேண்டும். கைத்தொழில், கிருஷி, கச்சவடம் முதலியவற்றில் நல்ல ஞானமுடையவர்களாயிருக்கவேண்டும்.

விழுந்து கிடக்கிற ஒரு கட்டிடத்தை, திரும்பிக் கட்டுவதற்கு எதெல்லாம் வேண்டும், உத்தேசம் எவ்வளவு தூகை வேண்டும் என்பதைப் பற்றி அறியவேண்டிய ஞானம் உடையவர்களாயிருக்கவேண்டும். ஒரு ஆற்றிலோ, குளத்திலோ ஒரு பெரிய உடைப்பு விழுந்தால், அதைச் சரிப்படுத்துவதற்கு எவ்வளவு பணம் கிலவாகும் என்பதையும் தெரியக்கூடியவர்களாயிருக்கவேண்டும். இந்த போர்டின் முக்கிய கருத்து தாழ்ந்தவர்களை உயர்த்தவேண்டுமெனபது. அதனால் தேனீ வளர்த்தல் (Bee keeping), கோழி வளர்த்தல் (Poulry farmering), நெசவு (Weaving) முதலிய பல வேலைகளைப்பற்றியும் நல்ல அறிவுள்ளவர்களாயிருந்தால் நல்லது. எக்கணமிக் கண்டிஷன் (Economic condition) நன்னுப் அறிந்தவர்களாயிருக்கவேண்டும். அபீஷியல் மெம்பர்களில் (Official members) எக்ஸிகூட்டிவ் இன்ஜினீயரும் (Executive engineer) ஒரு மெம்பராயிருக்கவேண்டும். பொதுவாக வெகுகாலம் business men ஆகயிருந்தவர்களை தெரிந்தெடுப்பது நலமாயிருக்கும். அனேகம் வேலையாள்களை வைத்து நடத்துகிறவர்களும் அதில் ஞானமிருக்கிறவர்களுமான இப்பொழுது இருக்கிற பிரஸிடெண்டு தகுதியான ஆள்.

இவ்வளவும் சொல்லிக்கொண்டு பிரமேயத்தை பலமாய் அனுகூலிக்கிறேன்.

SRY. T. NARAYANI AMMA (*Nominated*): Sir, I wish to offer a few words on this motion. I am emphatically of opinion that the work of the Economic Development Board should be continued but on a different constitution. The present board inspite of its very restricted scope of work has undoubtedly done some good work. But there is considerable scope for better work being done. My suggestion therefore is that the President of the Board may be asked to prepare a scheme on the recommendations made in the proposal of Mr. T. P. Velayudhan Pillai. The Board must be made as useful as possible. It must be able to deal with all aspects of the nation-building activities and such a board can undoubtedly do much useful work, for further utilising the natural resources of the State and further promoting the cause of the economic development of the State. I wish only to add that when I say that the Board must be re-constituted, I mean no disparagement whatever to the very good work done by those who have hitherto guided the destinies of the Board. All that I wish to say is that it can be and ought to be made more useful.

MR. KAINIKKARA M. PADMANABHA PILLAI: Mr. T. P. Velayudhan Pillai had moved a resolution in respect of the Board. I wish to suggest a few amendments to that:

(*a*) The number of members shall not be more than 15 of which the majority shall be non-officials;

(*b*) All Boards now attached to separate development departments shall be amalgamated with it;

(*c*) The Board shall work through sub-committees.

Mr. Janardana Pillai has already moved that the President of the Board shall be a full-time officer

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[At this stage the Dewan-President vacated the chair and it was occupied by the Deputy-President.]

MR. D. C. JOSEPH (*Nominated*): Sir, I wish to make a few observations. Government could readily admit that an institution like the present Economic Development Board could satisfactorily discharge its work to the satisfaction of the needs of the people in different parts of the State. But the number of members of the Board should be restricted to workable limits. I dare say that the Board which has been in existence for over 20 years has done very useful work in all directions and helped Government a great deal. Several recommendations of the Board have been acted upon by Government. Several problems relating to commerce and the general economic well being of the people at large have been successfully tackled.

My suggestion at this juncture is that the Government must reduce the number of member in the Board so that it may not be unwieldy. There should be a full-time officer also as President for the Board. Then it could function more effectively.

The strength of the Board could be reduced to 15 members. Just as there is a controller of yarn, another officer can be appointed to function over the Board, and several important departmental boards like agriculture and industries can be amalgamated to that body.

MR. T. T. KESAVAN SASTRI (*Nominated*) : ഗവണ്മെൻറ് സംഘടിപ്പിച്ചിട്ടുള്ള കമ്മറിക്കും എല്ലാം പ്രാധാന്യം അർഹിക്കുന്നതാണ്. അഡൈ്വസറിക്കമ്മറികളും ബോർഡുകളും അതാതുകാര്യങ്ങളിൽ ഗവണ്മെൻറിനു വേണ്ട അറിവുകൾ നൽകുന്നുണ്ട്. പല ഡിർപ്പാർട്ടുമെൻറുകളുടെയും ഭരണവിഷയകമായി സംഘടിതങ്ങളായ ബോർഡുകൾ പ്രയോജനപ്പെടുന്നുണ്ടെന്നുള്ള സംഗതി ഗവണ്മെൻറ് ശ്രദ്ധയിൽപ്പെട്ടിട്ട് വളരെ നാളുകളായി. പ്രസ്തുത ഡവലപ്പ്മെൻറ് ബോർഡിൻറെ പ്രയോജനം വളരെ വലുതാണ്. ബോർഡിൻറെ ശുപാർശകളെല്ലാം സ്വീകാര്യങ്ങളായിരുന്നുവെന്നു പറഞ്ഞാൽ എല്ലാ ശുപാർശകളും അതേപടി നടപ്പിലായി എന്നു ഞാൻ സമർത്ഥിക്കുന്നില്ല. രാജ്യത്തിൻറെ പുരോഗമനം സാമ്പത്തികാഭിവൃദ്ധിയെയാണാശ്രയിച്ചിരിക്കുന്നത്. അതിനു പറ്റുംപടികളായ നിർദ്ദേശങ്ങളും പ്രവർത്തനങ്ങളും നിർവഹിക്കാൻ ബോർഡിനു സാധിച്ചിട്ടുണ്ടെന്നാണ് എൻറെ വിശ്വാസം. കാർഷികവും വ്യാവസായികവുമായ ശ്രേയസ്സിനെ സംസ്ഥാപനംചെയ്യാൻ ബോർഡിൻറെ സേവനം ഗവണ്മെൻറിനു സഹായമായിരിക്കുന്നതാണ്. ഡവലപ്പ്മെൻറുബോർഡിൻറെ നേതൃത്വത്തിൽ വളരെ പ്രശസ്തമായ നിലയിൽ നടത്തിക്കൊണ്ടിരിക്കുന്ന എക്കണോമിക്ക് ജേർണൽ എത്രയോ വിജ്ഞാനപ്രദങ്ങളായ

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. T. T. Kesavan Sastri.]

ലേഖനങ്ങൾ പ്രസിദ്ധീകരിച്ചിരുന്നു എന്നു പറയേണ്ടതായിട്ടില്ല. ഈ ബോർഡിന്റെ അതായതു് അംഗങ്ങളുടെ എണ്ണം കുറയ്ക്കുകയോ കൂടുതൽ പരിഷ്ക്കാരങ്ങൾ വരുത്തുകയോ ചെയ്യുന്നതുകൊണ്ടു തരക്കേടില്ല. എന്തായാലും ഇതിന്റെ പുനഃസംഘടന ആവശ്യംതന്നെയാണു്. ഈ ബോർഡിന്റെ അദ്ധ്യക്ഷൻ ഒരു സാമ്പത്തികവിദഗ്ധൻതന്നെയായിരിക്കണം. ഇപ്പോഴത്തെ അദ്ധ്യക്ഷൻ ഇതിനു സർവ്വഥാ അർഹനും പ്രാപ്തനും തന്നെയാണു്. ഞാൻ ഈ ഉപക്ഷേപത്തെ ബലമായി അനുകൂലിച്ചുകൊള്ളുന്നു.

MR. KOTTALIL P. ABRAHAM: Now that we are considering the amalgamation of the Economic Development Board and the Agricultural Board, I would suggest that the amalgamation of the Economic Journal and the Travancore Information may also be taken up.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Is there any other Honourable Member wishing to move any other specific motion. Mr. Gopala Menon, do you wish to speak anything more?

MR. A. GOPALA MENON: I have only to offer a word of explanation. It was far from my mind to convey that the members of the Board have in any way been wanting in capacity or ability to discharge their duties. I thank Mr. Janardana Pillai and Mr. P. S. Mumamed for giving explicit information on the point and supplementing what I have said with regard to the work of the Board. That is all I have to say.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Now I shall put the propositions to the vote of the House. The first proposition is that "the number of members shall not be more than 15 of whom not more than 5 shall be officials."

The motion was put to vote and carried.

MR. PULIYOOR T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI: With regard to parts (*b*) and (*c*) of my motion, there is no amendment.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: The next proposition is that the Economic Development Board shall be amalgamated with the Agricultural Board. The Board of Agriculture has got its own constitution. The constitution of the proposed Board having been fixed, amalgamation will be an anamoly. That I think will be unworkable.

MR. KAINIKKARA M. PADMANABHA PILLAI: The purpose of the motion is that hereafter there shall not be any Agricultural Board.

MR. PULIYOOR T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI: That is one of the recommendations contained in the motion.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Then you will have to say that the Agricultural Board as such shall not function.

MR. KAINIKKARA M. PADMANABHA PILLAI: That will be the real effect.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: The second proposition before the House is that "the Board of Agriculture shall be amalgamated with the Board to be constituted, *i. e.* the Economic Development Board".

The motion was put and carried.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly